Classical and quantum dynamics of a charged scalar particle in a background of two counterpropagating plane waves

B. King
*Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Plymouth University, Plymouth, PL4 8AA, United Kingdom**

H. Hu
Hypervelocity Aerodynamics Institute, China Aerodynamics Research and Development Center, 621000 Mianyang, Sichuan, China

(Dated: September 27, 2016)

We consider a scalar particle in a background formed by two counter-propagating plane waves. Two cases are studied: i) dynamics at a magnetic node and ii) zero initial transverse canonical momentum. The Lorentz and Klein-Gordon equations are solved for these cases and approximations analysed. For the magnetic node solution (homogeneous, time-dependent electric field), the modified Volkov wavefunction which arises from a high-energy approximation is found to be inaccurate for all energies and the solution itself unstable when photon emission (nonlinear Compton scattering) is included. For the zero initial transverse canonical momentum case, in both quantum and classical cases, forbidden parameter regimes, absent in the plane wave model, are identified.

arXiv:1609.08105v1 [quant-ph] 22 Sep 2016

For quantum electrodynamical (QED) calculations in a strong laser background, a general method to deal with the interaction between laser fields and charged particles is to employ the laser-dressed particle-state solution of the relevant relativistic quantum dynamical equation (Dirac for fermions and Klein-Gordon (KG) for scalars). However, only for a very limited number of background fields has the exact solution been obtained analytically. The most widely used "Volkov states" are the solutions to the Dirac and KG equations in a plane-wave electromagnetic background (reviews can be found in [1–4]). These form the basis of the *plane wave model*. In this model, QED processes with highly relativistic incoming particles in an arbitrary laser field background are well-approximated by calculating the same processes in a plane-wave background. This is supposed valid when the electromagnetic invariants are much smaller than the classical and quantum nonlinearity parameters [5].

Due to the high degree of spatial focussing required to reach extreme field intensities in experiment, there has been recent interest in going beyond the plane wave model. Univariate, transverse but non-lightlike backgrounds have been studied for the case of $k^2 > 0$ (an electric vacuum) [6–11] and $k^2 < 0$ (a magnetic vacuum) [6, 12, 13]. Motivation for calculating QED in non-lightlike backgrounds stems from interest in quantum processes in dispersive media such as crystals [14] and plasmas [15] but also strong magnetic backgrounds such as found in astrophysical objects like magnetars [16].

The constructive interference that accompanies coherent addition of multiple laser pulses has often been suggested as a mechanism to reach the high field intensities required to trigger electron-positron cascades in an experiment [17, 18]. On the one hand, the magnetic node of a standing wave is a particularly popular background for simulations [19–23], which rely upon the locally constant field approximation [24, 25] within the plane wave model. On the other hand, there is a rich particle dynamics even when just two plane waves are combined to form a standing wave (this has recently been investigated classically when radiation reaction is incorporated [26]).

High-energy approximations for the wavefunction of scalar charged particles in a standing-wave background have recently been acquired [27], and corresponding deviations from the plane wave model for scalar nonlinear Compton scattering in a standing wave [28] and nonlinear Breit-Wheeler pair production in a focussed beam [29] have been suggested.

In the current paper, we solve the Lorentz and Klein-Gordon equations analytically to obtain the classical and quantum dynamics for a charged scalar particle in the background of two counter-propagating plane waves. Two solutions are presented: i) particle dynamics at a magnetic node and ii) dynamics for a particle with zero initial transverse canonical momentum.

The paper is organised as follows: in Sec. I the solution to the Lorentz equation is presented and some example particle trajectories plotted; in Sec. II solutions to the Klein-Gordon equation are presented; in Sec. III high-energy and WKB approximations to the KG equation are discussed and in Sec. IV the approximations are evaluated by comparing their quasi-momentum to the exact solution. The paper is then concluded in Sec. V. Natural units $\hbar = c = 1$ are employed throughout the paper.

* b.king@plymouth.ac.uk

I. CLASSICAL DYNAMICS

The Lorentz equation for a charge $e > 0$ with four-momentum p and mass m in an electromagnetic (EM) field with field tensor F is

$$\dot{p}^\mu = \frac{e}{m} F^{\mu\nu} p_\nu,$$

where a dot represents differentiation with respect to the proper time τ. Let $a = eA$ be the scaled vector potential, written as the sum of two plane waves: $a = a_1(\varphi_1) + a_2(\varphi_2)$, where $\varphi_j = k_j \cdot x$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$ with wavevectors satisfying $k_j \cdot k_j = k_j \cdot a_j = 0$. Then the Lorentz equation can be written as

$$\dot{\Pi}^\mu = \frac{p \cdot \dot{a}_1}{p \cdot k_1}\, k_1^\mu + \frac{p \cdot \dot{a}_2}{p \cdot k_2}\, k_2^\mu,$$

where $\Pi = p + a$ is the *canonical momentum*. Forming the scalar product of both sides of the equation with p_μ, it is clear that $p \cdot p$ is an invariant, as expected for a particle on the mass shell. For an arbitrary constant four-vector ε^μ, we find another conservation law:

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}\left[\left(\varepsilon - \frac{\varepsilon \cdot k_2}{k_1 \cdot k_2}\, k_1 - \frac{\varepsilon \cdot k_1}{k_1 \cdot k_2}\, k_2\right) \cdot \Pi\right] = 0. \tag{1}$$

Combining two equations that are formed when k_1 and k_2 are dotted into the Lorentz equation, a final "longitudinal" conservation law can be acquired:

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}\left[2k_1 \cdot \Pi\; k_2 \cdot \Pi - k_1 \cdot k_2\, \Pi^2\right] = 0. \tag{2}$$

One can define a useful four-vector:

$$\mathrm{e}_{l,j} = \varepsilon_{l,j} - \frac{\varepsilon_{l,j} \cdot k_2}{k_1 \cdot k_2}\, k_1 - \frac{\varepsilon_{l,j} \cdot k_1}{k_1 \cdot k_2}\, k_2,$$

for $l \in \{1, 2\}$, where $\varepsilon_{l,j}$ is the jth polarisation vector of a_l. Since $\mathrm{e}_{l,j} \cdot \Pi$ is conserved and $\mathrm{e}_{l,j} \cdot k_1 = \mathrm{e}_{l,j} \cdot k_2 = 0$, the set $\{\mathrm{e}_{l,1}, \mathrm{e}_{l,2}, k_1, k_2\}$ forms a useful basis.

One major difficulty in solving these sets of equations is encountered when seeking a separable solution. Consider the case of two counter-propagating circularly-polarised plane waves of the form:

$$a_l = m\xi_l \left[\varepsilon_{l,1} \cos\varphi_l + \varepsilon_{l,2} \sin\varphi_l\right], \tag{3}$$

where again $l \in \{1, 2\}$. If the longitudinal equation, Eq. (2), is solved first, the external field phases' dependency on the proper time can be used to solve the remaining equations. Defining the combinations $\varphi_\Delta = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2$, $\varphi_\Sigma = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2$, for counter-propagating waves we see that terms quadratic in the potential can be written $-a \cdot a/m^2 = \xi_\Sigma^2 - 4\xi_1\xi_2 \sin^2(\varphi_\Delta/2)$, which is just a function of φ_Δ, whereas terms linear in the potential can only be written as products of functions of both phase variables (subscripts Σ (Δ) correspond to adding (subtracting) the quantity from a_2 to (from) the quantity from a_1.) Elimination of either the quadratic or the linear term greatly simplifies analysis, and even the particle dynamics in two non-counter-propagating plane waves can be solved in this case.

To best demonstrate the main issues involved, let us now specialise to a head-on collision of plane waves, meaning $k_1 \cdot a_2 = k_2 \cdot a_1 = 0$ and $\varepsilon_{l,j} = \varepsilon_j$. Then

$$\dot{\varphi}_\Delta^2 - \dot{\varphi}_\Sigma^2 = \frac{(k_\Delta \cdot \Pi_{\mathrm{in}})^2}{m^2} - \frac{(k_\Sigma \cdot \Pi_{\mathrm{in}})^2}{m^2} + 2k_1 \cdot k_2 \frac{\Pi^2 - \Pi_{\mathrm{in}}^2}{m^2} \tag{4}$$

where quantities with subscript "in" correspond to initial values and $\Pi = \Pi(\varphi_\Delta, \varphi_\Sigma)$. The field-dependent part of the canonical momentum reduces to the Volkov exponent in the plane-wave limit of $k_2 \to k_1$, $a_2 \to 0$. For general initial conditions, the canonical momentum term is not separable. However, we can define two cases for which Eq. (2) yields an analytical solution.

Transverse motion at a magnetic node can be acquired by choosing the initial electron momentum to be entirely transverse and setting $\varphi_\Delta = 0$, implying $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = \varphi$ and $\Pi = \Pi(\varphi)$. This reduces Eq. (4) to a univariate ODE. To answer the question of whether this solution is stable, let us pick a frame in which $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = \omega$ and choose z as the propagation axis. Then if the plane waves are counter-propagating, the condition $\varphi_\Delta = 0$ implies $z = 0$, which we use to define the position of the magnetic node (other nodes are available at $\omega z = n\pi$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$). The particle will remain at this longitudinal position if the additional condition $\xi_1 = \xi_2$ is fulfilled. Then it can be shown that $\ddot{\varphi}_\Delta \propto \sin(\varphi_\Delta/2)$ and $\dot{\varphi}_\Delta \propto p_z$. Under these conditions, if $p_z = 0$ when $z = 0$, the particle will remain at $z = 0$ for all time. This implies the phase can be written $\varphi = \omega t = \bar{k} \cdot x := \bar{\varphi}$, where $\bar{k} = \omega(1, 0, 0, 0)$ is a timelike wavevector. We then note $-a^2 = m^2\xi_\Sigma^2$ and $p \cdot a$ can be rewritten using Eq. (1) as:

$$2p \cdot a + a^2 = 2\Pi_{\mathrm{in}} \cdot a - a^2. \tag{5}$$

to give:

$$\left(\frac{d\widetilde{\varphi}}{d\tau}\right)^2 = \varpi_\perp^2 - \mu_\perp^2 \sin^2\frac{\widetilde{\varphi}}{2} \tag{6}$$

$$\varpi_\perp^2 = \frac{(\bar{k} \cdot \Pi_{\mathrm{in}})^2}{m^2} + \bar{k}^2\left[\xi_\Sigma^2 - \frac{\Pi_{\mathrm{in}}^2 - m^2}{m^2} + 2\xi_\Sigma \frac{|\Pi_{\mathrm{in}}^\perp|}{m}\right];$$

$$\mu_\perp^2 = \frac{2\bar{k}^2 \xi_\Sigma |\Pi_{\mathrm{in}}^\perp|}{m},$$

where $|\Pi_{\mathrm{in}}^\perp|^2 = (\Pi_{\mathrm{in}} \cdot \varepsilon_1)^2 + (\Pi_{\mathrm{in}} \cdot \varepsilon_2)^2$, $\widetilde{\varphi} = \bar{\varphi} - \varphi_0$ and $\tan\varphi_0 = \Pi_{\mathrm{in}} \cdot \varepsilon_2 / \Pi_{\mathrm{in}} \cdot \varepsilon_1$. Eq. (4) can be directly integrated to give:

$$\bar{\varphi} = 2\,\mathrm{am}\left(\frac{\varpi_\perp \tau}{2}\middle|\, \frac{\mu_\perp^2}{\varpi_\perp^2}\right) + \varphi_0,$$

where am$(\cdot|\cdot)$ is the Jacobi amplitude function [30]. A further use of Eq. (1) yields an analytical solution to the transverse co-ordinates, but since this adds little to the discussion, it has not been included. Four conserved momenta were identified in this type of background, but since motion at a magnetic node is confined to a plane, it sufficies to use just the transverse degrees of freedom Eq. (1) and the on-shell condition $p^2 = m^2$. Example



FIG. 1. Demonstration of particle orbits at the magnetic node of a standing plane wave of $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = 10$, $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 0.01m$, $\bar{k}^2 = (0.01\,m)^2$. In order of increasing parameter $s = \mu_\perp^2/\varpi_\perp^2$: *Thin solid line:* $p_{\rm in} = -a_{\rm in}$ i.e. $\Pi_{\rm in} = 0$ and $s = 0$; *Dashed line:* $p_{\rm in}\cdot\varepsilon_1 = a_{\rm in}\cdot\varepsilon_1$; $p_{\rm in}\cdot\varepsilon_2 = 0.2a_{\rm in}\cdot\varepsilon_2$, $s = 0.72$; *Thick solid line:* $p_{\rm in}\cdot\varepsilon_1 \to 0$; $p_{\rm in}\cdot\varepsilon_2 \to 0$, $s = 0.96$. (In the right-hand plot $k = \bar{k}$.) As $s \to 1$, the trajectory tends to a straight line and the phase tends to a horizontal asymptote.

trajectories are plotted in Fig. 1. When $\Pi_{\rm in} = 0$, $s = \mu_\perp^2/\varpi_\perp^2 = 0$, and the well-known circular trajectory in a circularly-polarised background is recovered (e.g. as analysed in [31]). As $s \to 1$, the trajectory tends towards a straight line and $\lim_{\tau\to\infty}\bar{\varphi}(\tau) \to$ const. At a magnetic node, since $\xi_1 = \xi_2$, $z = 0$ and $p_z = 0$ are required for the solution to be stable, there is no "plane wave" limit to compare against.

Zero initial transverse canonical momentum also leads to the PDE in Eq. (4) being reducible to an ODE. The term a^2 depends just on φ_Δ, whereas $p\cdot a$ is a function of both φ_Δ and φ_Σ. Using Eq. (5) and setting the initial transverse canonical momentum to zero removes all terms linear in a so only φ_Δ-dependent terms remain. Then

$$\dot{\varphi}_\Delta^2 - \dot{\varphi}_\Sigma^2 = \frac{(k_\Delta\cdot p_{\rm in})^2}{m^2} - \frac{(k_\Sigma\cdot p_{\rm in})^2}{m^2} - \frac{k_\Delta^2\,a^2}{m^2}$$

For this set-up of fields, the right-hand side is additively separable, giving the two equations:

$$\dot{\varphi}_\Delta^2 = \frac{(k_\Delta\cdot p_{\rm in})^2}{m^2} + k_\Delta^2\left[\xi_\Sigma^2 - 4\xi_1\xi_2\sin^2\frac{\varphi_\Delta}{2}\right] \qquad (7)$$

$$\dot{\varphi}_\Sigma^2 = \frac{(k_\Sigma\cdot p_{\rm in})^2}{m^2}.$$

Here we notice the similarity with the magnetic node case Eq. (6). It is straightforward to show these yield the solution:

$$\varphi_\Delta = 2\,{\rm am}\left(\frac{\varpi_\Delta\tau}{2}\middle| -\frac{\mu_\Delta^2}{\varpi_\Delta^2}\right); \qquad \varphi_\Sigma = \frac{k_\Sigma\cdot p_{\rm in}}{m}\,\tau \quad (8)$$

$$\varpi_\Delta^2 = \frac{(k_\Delta\cdot p_{\rm in})^2}{m^2} + k_\Delta^2\xi_\Sigma^2; \qquad \mu_\Delta^2 = -4k_\Delta^2\xi_1\xi_2,$$

where τ is measured from $\varphi_\Delta = \varphi_\Sigma = 0$. (Also in this case an analytical expression for the transverse co-ordinates of the electron's trajectory can be ascertained by solving Eq. (1), but the solution in terms of Jacobi and elliptic functions is again unilluminating.) The signs of the square roots were chosen so that in the plane-wave limit $k_2 \to k_1$, $a_2 \to 0$, one recovers the result $\varphi_j = (k_j\cdot p_{\rm in}/m)\tau$ (see e.g. [32]). This can be seen directly when taking the plane-wave limit of the solution Eq. (8), for which $\mu_\Delta/\varpi_\Delta \to 0$ and ${\rm am}(x|0) = x$. As $|\mu_\Delta/\varpi_\Delta|$ varies between permitted values $0 \le |\mu_\Delta/\varpi_\Delta| < 1$, it therefore interpolates between the plane-wave limit and what one could call the *standing-wave limit*. We highlight that the classical solution predicts forbidden parameter regions for the particle dynamics. If $k_\Delta^2 a^2 > (k_\Delta\cdot p_{\rm in})^2$, there is no *real* solution for $\dot{\varphi}_\Delta$ (in Eq. (7)) and therefore for the phase. We will see this condition reappear in the quantum treatment.

An example of how the standing-wave limit compares, is given in Fig. 2. The standing-wave limit shows a trajectory with cusps forming a twisted helical structure, which is compared to the particle trajectory when $\xi_1 \ll \xi_2$. Even though $-k_\Delta^2 \ll m^2$, we see different dynamics from that in a plane wave. This follows as the solution parameter $|\mu_\Delta/\varpi_\Delta| \to 1$ if the limit $k_\Delta\cdot p_{\rm in} \to 0$ is taken. Although the circular trajectory with longitudinal drift is expected in a plane wave, and is seen in Fig. 2, this is not actually the plane-wave limit because $k_2 \neq k_1$. Instead, we label this the modified-plane-wave limit, which is reached when $(k_\Delta\cdot p_{\rm in})^2 \gg k_\Delta^2 a^2$, i.e. it corresponds to *high energies*. A further type of dynamics



FIG. 2. Demonstration of different particle orbits in a plane wave for $p_{\rm in} = m(20.0255, 0, 0, 20.0005)$, $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 0.01\,m$, $-k_\Delta^2 = (0.02\,m)^2$. *Left*: $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = 10$, *Right*: $\xi_1 = 0.01$, $\xi_2 = 10$.

occurs when $\xi_1 = \xi_2$ and $\omega_1 = \omega_2$ at $\varphi_\Delta = 2n\pi$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the particle is at a magnetic node (electric antinode), and will remain at rest (most easily seen from the equation for $\dot{\varphi}_\Delta$).

II. QUANTUM DYNAMICS

Here we solve the KG equation for a charged particle in the same (classical) electromagnetic background as in the previous section Eq. (3), and will consider the same two soluble cases. The KG equation can be written

$$\left[D^2 + m^2\right]\Phi = 0; \qquad D = \partial + ia.$$

Beginning with a Volkov-like ansatz: $\Phi = w(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)\exp(ip\cdot x)$, one acquires:

$$\begin{aligned} &2k_1\cdot k_2\, w_{12}'' + 2i\,\Pi\cdot(k_1 w_1' + k_2 w_2') \\ &-(\Pi^2 - m^2)w = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where subscript 1,2 correspond to differentiation by φ_1 and φ_2 respectively. In the plane-wave limit, $k_2 \to k_1$, $a_2 \to 0$, then $k_1\cdot k_2 = 0$ and we recover the Volkov solution:

$$\Phi(\varphi) = \exp\left\{i\left[p\cdot x + u^{\rm pw}(\varphi)\right]\right\},$$

where we define the *Volkov exponent*:

$$u^{\rm pw}(\varphi) = -\int^{\varphi} \frac{2p\cdot a(\phi) + a^2(\phi)}{2k\cdot p}\, d\phi. \tag{10}$$

In the quantum treatment, which relies upon asymptotic states, p is the incoming particle momentum and as such can be identified with $p_{\rm in}$ from the previous section on classical dynamics.

Transverse motion at a magnetic node can be found when searching for a solution $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = \bar{\varphi} = \bar{k}\cdot x$ and inserting an ansatz $\Phi = w(\bar{\varphi})\exp(ip\cdot x)$ into the KG equation. Then instead of the PDE Eq. (9), one acquires an ODE in $\bar{\varphi}$:

$$\bar{k}^2\, w'' + 2i\, p\cdot\bar{k}\; w' + \left[\xi_\Sigma^2 - 2a\cdot p\right] w = 0. \tag{11}$$

When compared to the KG in a non-lightlike plane wave (e.g. Eq. (16) in [13] [33]), we see that the KG equation at a magnetic node is equivalent in form to a plane wave with timelike wavevector ($\bar{k}^2 > 0$), i.e. in an *electric vacuum*. (In a homogeneous, time-dependent electric field, a variety of phenomena such as pair-creation and Cerenkov radiation are expected to occur [6].) Putting the equation in normal form using:

$$w = F(\bar{\varphi})\,\exp\left[-i\,\frac{\bar{k}\cdot p}{\bar{k}^2}\;\bar{\varphi}\right],$$

one acquires:

$$\frac{d^2F(y)}{dy^2} + \left[\lambda - 2Q\cos(2y)\right]F(y) = 0, \tag{12}$$

$$\lambda = \lambda_\perp = 4\,\frac{(\bar{k}\cdot p)^2 + \xi_\Sigma^2 m^2\bar{k}^2}{\bar{k}^4}; \quad Q = Q_\perp = 4\,\frac{\xi_\Sigma m|p^\perp|}{\bar{k}^2} \tag{13}$$

and $y = (\bar{\varphi} - \varphi_0 - \pi/4)/2$. Eq. (12) is a canonical form of the Mathieu equation [30]. In the current situation, it resembles the Schrödinger equation for a sinusoidal potential. We discuss the solutions of the Mathieu equation after presenting the solution to the second case.

Again, one can question the stability of the magnetic node solution, especially since one is dealing with a wavefunction in the quantum case and not a point particle as in the classical case. To answer this, consider the current

$$j^\mu = \Phi^\dagger\partial^\mu\Phi - \partial^\mu\left(\Phi^\dagger\right)\Phi + 2a^\mu\Phi^\dagger\Phi,$$

where $\Phi = \Phi(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)$. What concerns us is the longitudinal current. If we use $\Phi = w(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)\exp(i\,p\cdot x)$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} j^3(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = &-2ip^3|w|^2 + k_1^3\,(w^* w_1' - w_1^{*\prime} w) \\ &+k_2^3\,(w^* w_2' - w_2^{*\prime} w)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

We see that if $p^3 = 0$ and $k_1^3 = -k_2^3$ then j^3 is both antisymmetric in exchange of arguments, but necessarily symmetric in the limit $\varphi_1 - \varphi_2 \to 0$, so we can conclude j^3 is identically zero. Therefore at this order of calculation, also in the quantum case the magnetic node solution is stable.

Zero initial transverse canonical momentum can be solved for in the quantum case, by making the ansatz $\Phi = w(\varphi_\Delta)\exp(ip\cdot x)$ to rewrite the KG equation as:

$$k_\Delta^2\, w'' + 2i\,\Pi\cdot k_\Delta w' - (\Pi^2 - m^2)w = 0. \tag{15}$$

We recall that p is the asymptotic viz. the initial free-particle momentum, assuming the external field is switched on adiabatically. Compared with the classical case, a simplification is acquired in the quantum case already if $p_{\rm in}^\perp = 0$. Then if the field is switched on adiabatically, also $a_{\rm in}^\perp = 0$, so the condition on $p_{\rm in}^\perp$ is equivalent to requiring $\Pi_{\rm in}^\perp = 0$. In this case the canonical momentum squared is again additively separable in φ_Δ and φ_Σ. Because the choice of background gives no dependency on φ_Σ, it is not required in order to parametrise the wavefunction. The φ_Δ-dependent terms then give:

$$k_\Delta^2\; w'' + 2ip\cdot k_\Delta\; w' - a^2 w = 0.$$

This is reminiscent of the KG equation in a non-lightlike plane wave but with the phase variable replaced with φ_Δ, where since $k_\Delta^2 < 0$, the plane wave is in a *magnetic vacuum*, a situation recently analysed in [13]. We then apply the simple transformation:

$$w = J(\varphi_\Delta)\exp\left[-i\;\frac{k_\Delta\cdot p}{k_\Delta^2}\,\varphi_\Delta\right], \tag{16}$$

to acquire:

$$J'' + \frac{1}{k_\Delta^2}\left[\varpi_\Delta^2 + \mu_\Delta^2\sin^2\frac{\varphi_\Delta}{2}\right]J = 0. \tag{17}$$

This is again the Mathieu equation Eq. (12) with:

$$\lambda = \lambda_\Delta = \frac{4[(k_\Delta \cdot p)^2 + (\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2)m^2 k_\Delta^2]}{k_\Delta^4};$$

$$Q = Q_\Delta = -\frac{4\xi_1\xi_2}{k_\Delta^2},$$

and $y = \varphi_\Delta/2$. Integration constants have once again been chosen to reproduce the correct zero-field limit. The plane-wave limit is acquired by taking the limit $k_\Delta^2 \to 0$ and $a_2 \to 0$. Eq. (17) then tends to the potential-free Schrödinger equation and the φ_Δ-dependent terms in the phase become:

$$\frac{\varphi_\Delta}{k_\Delta^2}\left[-k_\Delta \cdot p + \sqrt{(k_\Delta \cdot p)^2 - k_\Delta^2 a^2}\right] \to \frac{-\varphi_\Delta\, a^2}{2k_\Delta \cdot p}. \quad (18)$$

Supposing $k_2 = k_1(1-\delta)$, and taking the limit $\delta \to 0$, the plane-wave (Volkov) exponent Eq. (10) is recovered (recall, $a \cdot p = 0$).

The Mathieu equation is common to both electric and magnetic cases. The solution to the Mathieu equation can be written in terms of the *Mathieu characteristic exponent* or *Floquet exponent* $\nu(\lambda, Q)$ [34]:

$$J(\varphi_\Delta) = \mathrm{e}^{i\nu\varphi_\Delta/2}\,\phi(\varphi_\Delta/2); \quad \phi(\varphi_\Delta/2 + 2n\pi) = \phi(\varphi_\Delta/2), \quad (19)$$

which depending on the sign of its imaginary part, can represent stable regions (bands) ($\mathrm{Im}\,\nu = 0$) or unstable regions (gaps), in which the wavefunction diverges (plotted in Fig. 3). The only physical solution for the wavefunction in the gaps is the trivial solution $J = 0$. When the coupling Q is *weak*, the gaps become narrower and in the limit $Q \to 0$, they become infinitesimally thin and parameter values become continuous. This occurs at high particle energy where the dynamics approach the plane wave limit. When the coupling Q increases, so do the widths of the gaps and tunnelling between bands becomes increasingly suppressed [34]. Just as in the classical case, we see from Fig. 3 that, for the case of zero initial transverse canonical momentum, also in the quantum case no solution exists for when $(k_\Delta \cdot p)^2 < k_\Delta^2 a^2$, where $\lambda_\Delta < 0$.

III. APPROXIMATIONS

The solution to the Mathieu equations gives the exact wavefunction for the two cases under consideration. However, it is useful to study how these wavefunctions can be approximated so that scattering calculations become practicable. In particular, how the solutions compare with using the plane wave model. Approximations to solutions of the Mathieu equation have recently been discussed in the context of a magnetic vacuum [13]



FIG. 3. Regions of instability (gaps) in λ-Q space where $\mathrm{Im}\,\nu \neq 0$, are indicated by the linear hatched regions. In both the magnetic-node and zero initial transverse canonical momentum cases, allowed parameters are in the shaded region between the dashed lines, $0 \leq Q < \lambda/2$. There are no stable states for $\lambda < 0$, which corresponds to the classically-forbidden region.

and we reiterate some of the arguments here in terms of the magnetic vacuum case of zero initial transverse canonical momentum in a standing wave.

Rather than studying bands and gaps, an alternative perspective is provided by returning to the Mathieu equation for J in Eq. (17) and recognising that, generally speaking for intense optical laser fields and initially accelerated particles, k_Δ^2/m^2 is the smallest parameter. Since the smallest parameter multiplies the highest derivative, the problem is well-suited to multiple scale perturbation theory [35]. When applied to the Schrödinger equation, the leading order approximation is equivalent to the leading-order approximation from WKB [36]. Here, we use multiple scale analysis (singular perturbation theory) on Eq. (17), which can be viewed as the equation of a simple harmonic oscillator with a slowly-varying natural frequency. The multiple scale approach consists of defining another propagation scale $\varphi_\Delta^{\mathrm{ms}} = f(\varphi_\Delta)$ and demanding that the natural frequency of the oscillator be constant [35]. For Eq. (17), this new propagation scale (whose sign was again chosen to reproduce the free-particle wavefunction in the zero-field limit) is:

$$\varphi_\Delta^{\mathrm{ms}}(\varphi_\Delta) = \frac{m}{k_\Delta^2}\int^{\varphi_\Delta} d\phi\; \dot{\varphi}_\Delta^{\mathrm{cl}}(\phi) \quad (20)$$

$$\dot{\varphi}_\Delta^{\mathrm{cl}}(\phi) = \sqrt{\frac{(k_\Delta \cdot p)^2}{m^2} + k_\Delta^2\left[\xi_\Sigma^2 - 4\xi_1\xi_2\sin^2\frac{\phi}{2}\right]}. \quad (21)$$

Comparing this with the classical case Eq. (7), we see $\varphi_\Delta^{\mathrm{ms}}$ is just the integral of the classical $\dot{\varphi}_\Delta$, which we denote $\dot{\varphi}_\Delta^{\mathrm{cl}}$, with respect to the "timescale" $-m\,k \cdot x/k_\Delta^2$.

Identifying k_Δ^2 with $\hbar$ and introducing the particle energy $\mathcal{E}$, the relation of the new scale $\varphi_\Delta^{\rm ms}$ to the classical quantity $\varphi_\Delta^{\rm cl}$ is reminiscent of the relation between the quantum phase $i\mathcal{E}t/\hbar$ and the classical phase $i\omega t$.

Including the first three terms in the multi scale perturbation expansion gives:

$$J^{\rm ms}(\varphi_\Delta) = \left(1 - \frac{k_\Delta^2\, a^2(\varphi_\Delta)}{(k_\Delta\cdot p)^2}\right)^{-1/4}\Bigg|_{O(k_\Delta^2)} \exp\left[iu^{\rm ms}(\varphi_\Delta)\right], \tag{22}$$

where in line with the notation of other exponents in this paper, we define $u^{\rm ms}(\varphi_\Delta) = \varphi_\Delta^{\rm ms}(\varphi_\Delta)$. Indeed, by including higher orders in the singular perturbation expansion, the band-like structure of the Mathieu solution can be reconstructed [35], so one might expect this approximation to include all physical effects. As already pointed out in Eq. (18), if $(k_\Delta\cdot p)^2 \gg k_\Delta^2 a^2$ and the square-root is expanded, then the modified-plane-wave limit is recovered. In contrast, if the electron starts from rest and the frequencies of the two plane waves are equal, then $k_\Delta\cdot p = 0$, and the plane wave model is not applicable. Therefore, we should suspect the plane wave model to become questionable at some point between these two situations, when $(k_\Delta\cdot p)^2 \not\gg k_\Delta^2 a^2$.

The most drastic but versatile approximation is what we call the *high energy approximation*. By using the following product ansatz in the original KG equation:

$$w = F(\varphi_1)G(\varphi_2)H(\varphi_\Delta)\mathbb{e}^{ip\cdot x}, \tag{23}$$

one acquires:

$$k_\Delta^2\left[\frac{H''}{H} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{F'}{F}\frac{G'}{G} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{F'}{F}\frac{H'}{H} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{G'}{G}\frac{H'}{H}\right] + 2ik_\Delta\cdot p\,\frac{H'}{H}$$
$$+2ik_1\cdot p\frac{F'}{F} + 2ik_2\cdot p\frac{G'}{G} - 2p\cdot a_1 - 2p\cdot a_2 - a\cdot a = 0. \tag{24}$$

Neglecting all terms of order k_Δ^2, makes the equation additively separable and the field-dependent terms can be exponentiated:

$$H = \mathbb{e}^{-i\int^{\varphi_\Delta}\frac{a^2}{2k_\Delta\cdot p}};\quad F = \mathbb{e}^{-i\int^{\varphi_1}\frac{p\cdot a_1}{k_1\cdot p}};\quad G = \mathbb{e}^{-i\int^{\varphi_2}\frac{p\cdot a_2}{k_2\cdot p}}. \tag{25}$$

We call this approach that neglects second-order derivatives in the KG equation in this way the "high energy approximation". (Eq. (25) is the "simplified solution" presented in a recent analysis of the Klein-Gordon equation (Eq. 76 of [27]) for a related but different case to the one studied here, of a high-energy particle colliding obliquely with counter-propagating laser waves.) For the zero initial transverse canonical momentum case, this approximation can be related to the more accurate multi scale solution, which *does* take into account the second derivative. To justify the labelling "high energy approximation", we recall arguments from [13] for the convenience of the reader. Ostensibly, one might presume that this high energy approximation is valid when k_Δ^2 is the smallest parameter so the second derivative can be neglected. However, when this is the case, it is multiplying the largest derivative, and so when the approximation is made, one is assuming "$k_\Delta^2\times$ quadratic derivatives" is the smallest term in Eq. (24). Moreover, when the high energy approximation is used, one is assuming that the solution is perturbative in k_Δ^2 and one is calculating the leading-order term. However Eq. (24) cannot be attacked using regular perturbation theory because, when $k_\Delta^2\to 0$, one of the solutions disappears [35]. Instead, it is of the form that *singular perturbation theory* may work, in other words when an asymptotic approximation is useful. We refer to Eq. (25) as the high energy approximation because, when one expands the square root of the singular perturbation result Eq. (21) for $(k_\Delta\cdot p)^2 \gg k_\Delta^2 a^2$ and combines it with the rest of the solution in Eq. (16), one acquires the approximate solution of the KG equation:

$$w \approx H(\varphi_\Delta)\mathbb{e}^{ip\cdot x}.$$

For the case of zero initial transverse canonical momentum, since we implicity assume that a is zero in the infinite past and future, $p\cdot\varepsilon_1 = p\cdot\varepsilon_2 = 0$, so F and G are unity in this case. Then, we see that $(k_\Delta\cdot p)^2 \gg k_\Delta^2 a^2$ corresponds to Eq. (23), justifying the term "high energy approximation". Therefore the condition k_Δ^2 being the smallest parameter is not sufficient to acquire Eq. (25). If the plane waves are counter-propagating and of equal frequency then the condition $(k_\Delta\cdot p)^2 \gg k_\Delta^2 a^2$ reduces to $(p_z/m)^2 \gg \xi_\Sigma^2$, for longitudinal particle momentum p_z, which is very similar to the requirement $\gamma \gg \xi$ in recent approaches to derive electron states [37] and propagators [38] of ultrarelativistic electrons in general background fields.

We will begin the following section with the high energy approximation of the magnetic node solution. Unlike for the zero initial transverse canonincal momentum case, we will see there is no condition for the high energy approximation to be valid at the magnetic node, and it cannot be related to more accurate approximations. Naïvely, the condition for the high energy approximation to be valid would be $(\bar{k}\cdot p)^2 \gg -\bar{k}^2(a^2 + 2a\cdot p)$, since here $p\cdot a \neq 0$. The high energy approximation can be acquired by taking the limit $\varphi_\Delta \to 0$ in Eq. (25), which gives:

$$\Phi(\bar{\varphi}) = \exp\left\{i\left[p\cdot x + u^{\rm pw}(\bar{\varphi})\right]\right\}.$$

(This solution can also be acquired by solving Eq. (11) in the limit $\bar{k}^2 \to 0$). The plane wave limit is then acquired when $\bar{\varphi}\to\varphi$ and $a_2 \to 0$.

IV. PHOTON EMISSION

In this section we consider some aspects of photon emission (nonlinear Compton scattering) in the magnetic node solution to the KG equation. First, let us study the situation in (3+1)D. We recall the interaction Lagrangian density in scalar QED (sQED) can be written [39]:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm int} = -i\,\bar{a}^\mu \Phi^\dagger \partial_\mu \Phi + i\bar{a}^\mu \partial_\mu(\Phi^\dagger)\Phi + \bar{a}\cdot\bar{a}\;\Phi^\dagger\Phi$$

for the photon field $e\hat{A} = \bar{a} = \hat{a} + a$, where a is the classical, external-field component discussed until now and $\hat{a}$ is the field of the emitted photon. Then we define:

$$\hat{a}^\mu = e\;\mathrm{e}^\mu \frac{1}{\sqrt{2Vl'^0}}\,\mathbb{e}^{i\,l'\cdot x}; \qquad \Phi_{p'} = \frac{\mathbb{e}^{i\,p'\cdot x + i u_{p'}(\bar{\varphi})}}{\sqrt{2Vp'^0}}, \tag{26}$$

where $\mathrm{e}^2 = -1$ and the function $u_{p'}(\bar{\varphi})$ has yet to be chosen. Writing the scattering matrix element as $S_{\rm fi} = -\int d^4x\,\mathcal{L}_{\rm int}$, the calculation can proceed as usual, but with modified charged particle states. It can be shown that:

$$|S_{\rm fi}|^2 \sim \delta^{(4)}\left(l' + q' - q - s\,k\right), \tag{27}$$

where q is the quasi-momentum in the particular model used. Let us first consider the high energy approximation. In this case, the quasi-momentum $q^{\rm he} = p - (a^2/2p\cdot\bar{k})\,\bar{k}$, so that:

$$(q^{\rm he})^2 = m^2\left[1 + \xi_\Sigma^2 + \left(\frac{m^2}{\bar{k}\cdot p}\right)^2 \frac{\bar{k}^2}{4m^2}\,\xi_\Sigma^4\right] = (m_*^{\rm he})^2,$$

is the "effective mass" which tends to the effective mass familiar from plane-wave calculations in a monochromatic circularly-polarised background $(q^{\rm pw})^2 = m^2(1+\xi_\Sigma^2)$ if the plane-wave limit $\bar{k}\to k$, $a_2 \to 0$ is taken. Alternatively, one can use the multi scale approach for the magnetic node case to calculate the quasi-momentum. The non-trivial phase in this approach is of the form Eq. (20), which can be integrated analytically. Then the phase dependency of the KG solution is:

$$u_p^{\rm ms}(\bar{\varphi}) = -\frac{\bar{k}\cdot p}{\bar{k}^2}\,\bar{\varphi} + \frac{\varpi_{\perp,p} m}{\bar{k}^2}\,\mathrm{E}\left(\frac{\bar{\varphi}}{2}\middle|\frac{\mu_{\perp,p}^2}{\varpi_{\perp,p}^2}\right),$$

where the constants $\varpi_{\perp,p}$ and $\mu_{\perp,p}$ are taken from the classical phase Eq. (6), but now in the quantum case with $\Pi_{\rm in} = p$ so that:

$$\varpi_{\perp,p}^2 = \frac{(\bar{k}\cdot p)^2}{m^2} + \bar{k}^2\xi_\Sigma^2\left[1 + \frac{2|p^\perp|}{m\xi_\Sigma}\right]; \quad \mu_{\perp,p}^2 = \frac{4\bar{k}^2\xi_\Sigma|p^\perp|}{m},$$

and $\mathrm{E}(\cdot|\cdot)$ is the elliptic integral of the second kind [30]. Just as the cycle average of the Volkov exponent $u^{\rm pw}(\varphi)$ is separated out of the rest of the integral to acquire the quasi-momentum, so too can here the average of the multiple scale exponent be separated out:

$$u_p^{\rm ms}(\bar{\varphi}) \approx \langle u_p^{\rm ms}\rangle\,\bar{\varphi} + \int^{\bar{\varphi}} \Delta u,$$

$$\langle u_p^{\rm ms}\rangle = -\frac{\bar{k}\cdot p}{\bar{k}^2} + \frac{2}{\pi}\frac{\varpi_{\perp,p} m}{\bar{k}^2}\,\mathrm{E}\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\middle|\frac{\mu_{\perp,p}^2}{\varpi_{\perp,p}^2}\right)$$

where the cycle-average of the remaining term Δu is zero (a study of the dependence of this type of approximation on pulse duration can be found in [40]). Then the quasi-momentum becomes $q^{\rm ms} = p + \langle u_p^{\rm ms}\rangle\,\bar{k}$. One can likewise define a quasi-momentum for the exact solution, by using the Mathieu characteristic exponent from Eq. (19) to give:

$$q = p - \left[\frac{\bar{k}\cdot p}{\bar{k}^2} - \frac{\nu_{\perp,p}(\lambda_\perp, Q_\perp)}{2}\right]\bar{k}.$$

We recall that:

$$\frac{Q_\perp}{\lambda_\perp} = \frac{|p^\perp|\xi_\Sigma}{1 + |p^\perp|^2 + \xi_\Sigma^2} \le \frac{1}{2}.$$

If $|p^\perp|$ is much greater or much less than ξ_Σ, this ratio is much less than one, and $\nu_{\perp,p}(\lambda_\perp, Q_\perp) \approx \sqrt{\lambda_\perp}$, [34], which immediately gives the connection with the multi scale approach Eq. (21). The accuracy of this approximation therefore gives a condition for when the accuracy of the multi scale approach should be good.

At the magnetic node, since the dimensionality of the system has been reduced, the high energy approximation and the wide-angle scattering limit of $p^\perp/m \to \infty$ are not independent of one another . This can be seen by considering the high energy approximation phase dependency, which we recall is the Volkov exponent with the wavevector replaced with $\bar{k}$:

$$u^{\rm he}(\bar{\varphi}) = -\int^{\bar{\varphi}} \frac{2p\cdot a(\phi) + a^2(\phi)}{2\bar{k}\cdot p}\,d\phi.$$

Now, in the usual plane-wave case, the limits $k\cdot p \to \infty$ and $p\cdot a \to \infty$ are independent of one another. Here however, since $\bar{k}\cdot p = \omega[m^2 + (p^\perp)^2]^{1/2}$, and $p\cdot a = \xi|p^\perp|\cos(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_0)$ where $\tan\bar{\varphi}_0 = p\cdot\varepsilon_2/p\cdot\varepsilon_1$, the high energy limit and the wide-angle scattering limit, which, in a plane wave correspond to different physics, are at the magnetic node of a standing wave, connected. A consequence is that the high energy approximation, where one expects the multi scale result to agree with the plane-wave limit, is also the wide-angle scattering limit and hence the approximation of neglecting the second derivative term in the KG equation becomes *worse*, not better, as displayed in Fig. 4. Since the high energy approximation is (näively) expected to be useful when $(\bar{k}\cdot p)^2 \gg -\bar{k}^2(a^2 + p\cdot a)$, it is not surprising that for strong fields, the high energy effective mass $(q^{\rm he})^2$, diverges from the exact result. More surprising is that for strong fields, the multi scale and exact results tend to the plane wave limit, as displayed in Fig. 5 (this can be proven from Eq. (11)). None of the approximations capture the band structure of the exact solution, which is displayed by regions of non-zero imaginary quasi-momentum.



FIG. 4. A log-log plot effective mass varies with increasing transverse momentum for $\xi_\Sigma = 1$, $\bar{k}^2 = (0.01\,\mathrm{m})^2$. The multi scale result agrees exactly with the analytical result from the Mathieu characteristic exponent, whereas the high energy approximation disagrees at both high and low energy.



FIG. 5. A log-log plot of how the effective mass varies with increasing intensity parameter ξ_Σ for $\bar{k}^2 = (5\,\mathrm{m})^2$ and $p^\perp = 2\,m$. The large value of $\bar{k}^2$ has been chosen to emphasise the band structure. For $\bar{k}^2 \ll 1$, the discrepancies between the high energy and plane wave approximation with the multi scale and exact results persist.

These results can be compared to the reasoning of the plane wave model. The standard argument [1] is that QED is a relativistic theory and so all observables are to be built from relativistic invariants. For a single seed particle of momentum p, four relativistic invariants are identified ξ and $\eta = k\cdot p/m^2$, for a relevant external-field wavevector k, $\mathcal{F} = -e^2F^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}/4m^4$ and $\mathcal{G} = -e^2F^{\mu\nu}F^*_{\mu\nu}/4m^4$, where $F^*_{\mu\nu}$ is the dual Faraday tensor [41]. The probability of a QED process can then be expressed as a function of these parameters $P = P(\xi,\eta,\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G})$ and when $\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G} \ll \xi,\eta,1$ this can be expanded in a Taylor series in $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$, the leading order of which is $P(\xi,\eta,0,0)$ [42]. Assuming the depedency on $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ is perturbative, or the non-perturbative dependency is vanishingly small, this leading order term, which is the probability of the process in a plane wave background, is a valid approximation. In the magnetic node case, the relevant wavevector is $\bar{k}$ and there is a fifth relativistic invariant, $\bar{k}^2$. The (näive) condition that the high energy approximation of Volkov (plane-wave) form is a good approximation was $(\bar{k}\cdot p)^2 \gg -\bar{k}^2(a^2 + p\cdot a)$, which in these invariants becomes $\eta^2 \gg \mathcal{F}$. We can conclude that i) for the typical case of $\eta < 1$, this is a more stringent condition on the smallness of $\mathcal{F}$ than is usually argued, for the plane wave model to be valid and ii) where one expects the plane wave model to tend to the exact result at high particle energies, at the magnetic node in a standing wave it tends to the incorrect result at the level of the quasimomentum.

Suppose we continue with the scattering calculation. In the plane wave limit, following the standard method [43], we find the probability for photon emission per unit external-field phase $W = \sum_s W_s$, which can be written in the usual way as a sum over harmonics s, is:

$$W_s = \frac{\alpha m^2}{4k\cdot p}\int_0^{u_s}\frac{du}{(1+u)^2}\left[-4J_s^2\,\frac{m_*^2}{m^2} + 2\xi^2\left(J_{s+1}^2 + J_{s-1}^2\right)\right], \tag{28}$$

for $m_*^2 = m^2(1+\xi^2)$, where the Bessel functions of the first kind J_s have arguments z:

$$z = \frac{2s\xi}{\sqrt{1+\xi^2}}\sqrt{\frac{u}{u_s}\left(1-\frac{u}{u_s}\right)},$$

with $u_s = 2s\,k\cdot p/m^2(1+\xi^2)$. The sQED result Eq. (28) is very close to the QED version [43], but without spin-dependent terms (it agrees with a similar recent calculation [28]).

However, if one attempts to use the high energy approximation of the magnetic node solution in the same calculation, a problem becomes immediately obvious. From the longitudinal component of Eq. (27) one notes that $q'^{\parallel} = -l'^{\parallel}$. Since a requirement of the magnetic node solution is that $q'^{\parallel} = 0$, we see that after emitting a photon, the particle is, in general, placed into a *different* outgoing state, and not $\Phi_{p'}$. This leads to a contradiction, so we conclude the magnetic node solution of a scalar particle in a standing wave is *unstable* due to radiation emission.

That the magnetic node solution is unstable when radiative emission is taken into account, is reminiscent

of ponderomotive effects on a charged particle in an inhomogeneous background. *Ponderomotive trapping* is a well-known phenomenon [44, 45] where field gradients drive electrons into *minima* of the potential, i.e. magnetic *antinodes*. The force on the scalar particle depends however on the phase of the field when it is scattered. If in the correct orientation, the magnetic field may produce a restoring force on the scattered particle and drive it back to the magnetic node. This is sometimes referred to as *anomalous radiative trapping* [46].

V. CONCLUSION

Solutions have been presented for a scalar particle in a background formed of two counter-propagating plane waves. Two cases were studied: when the particle is confined to a magnetic node (electric vacuum) and when the particle has zero initial transverse canonical momentum (magnetic vacuum). Both the classical dynamics (Lorentz equation) and the quantum dynamics (Klein-Gordon equation) were solved analytically. Different approximations to the quantum dynamics were presented. First, the high energy approximation of neglecting quadratic and second-order derivatives yields a "modified" Volkov (plane-wave) wavefunction. Second, an asymptotic approximation using multi scale perturbation theory gave a WKB-like solution that retains dependency on the second derivative. Aspects of photon emission (nonlinear Compton scattering) were studied using the high energy approximation of dynamics at a magnetic node. It was found that the magnetic node solution is in general unstable when radiation emission is taken into account. Moreover, whilst at the magnetic node, since motion is confined to a plane, the high-energy and the wide-angle scattering limit become conflated. Describing wide-angle scattering generally requires the second derivative, and by studying the particle's quasi-momentum it was found that the high-energy Volkov-like approximation disagrees with the multi scale and exact results at low and high energies. If standard arguments about when the plane wave model is valid, are used to justify approximating the background as a plane wave, the predicted quasimomentum disagrees with the exact result.

For the magnetic vacuum case, forbidden parameter regions were identified in the classical and quantum dynamics. If the particle starts with zero longitudinal momentum, these forbidden regions $k_\Delta^2 a^2 > (k_\Delta \cdot p)^2$ are quite accessible to experiment, but are completely missed in the plane wave model.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

B. K. acknowledges support from the Royal Society International Exchanges Scheme, the generous hospitality of H. H., CARDC (Chinese Aerodynamics Research and Development Center) and of SWUST (Southwest University of Science and Technology), Sichuan, China. H. H. acknowledges the financial support by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 11204370.

[1] V. I. Ritus, J. Russ. Laser Res. **6**, 497 (1985).
[2] M. Marklund and P. K. Shukla, Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 591 (2006).
[3] A. Di Piazza et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 1177 (2012).
[4] B. King and T. Heinzl, High Power Laser Science and Engineering **4**, e5 (2016), hep-ph/1510.08456.
[5] N. B. Narozhny and A. M. Fedotov, Contemporary Physics **56**, 249 (2015).
[6] W. Becker, Physica A **87**, 601 (1977).
[7] J. T. Mendonca and A. Serbeto, Phys. Rev. E **83**, 026406 (2011).
[8] E. Raicher and S. Eliezer, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 022113 (2013).
[9] S. Varro, Laser Phys. Lett. **10**, 095301 (2013).
[10] S. Varro, Laser Phys. Lett. **11**, 016001 (2014).
[11] E. Raicher, S. Eliezer, and A. Zigler, Phys. Lett. B **750**, 76 (2015).
[12] C. Cronström and M. Noga, Phys. Lett. A **60**, 137 (1977).
[13] T. Heinzl, A. Ilderton, and B. King, arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.07449v1 (2016).
[14] U. I. Uggerhøj, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 1131 (2005).
[15] A. Di Piazza, K. Z. Hatsagortsyan, and C. H. Keitel, Phys. Plasmas **14**, 032102 (2007).
[16] A. K. Harding and D. Lai, Rep. Prog. Phys. **69**, 2631 (2006).
[17] S. S. Bulanov, V. D. Mur, N. B. Narozhny, J. Nees, and V. S. Popov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 220404 (2010).
[18] E. Gelfer, A. Mironov, A. Fedotov, V. Bashmakov, E. Nerush, I. Y. Kostyukov, and N. Narozhny, Physical Review A **92**, 022113 (2015).
[19] A. R. Bell and J. G. Kirk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 200403 (2008).
[20] E. N. Nerush et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 035001 (2011).
[21] N. V. Elkina et al., Phys. Rev. ST Accel. Beams **14**, 054401 (2011).
[22] B. King, N. Elkina, and H. Ruhl, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 042117 (2013).
[23] A. A. Mironov, N. B. Narozhny, and A. M. Fedotov, Phys. Lett. A **378**, 3254 (2014).
[24] B. King and H. Ruhl, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 013005 (2013).
[25] C. N. Harvey, A. Ilderton, and B. King, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 013822 (2015).
[26] J. G. Kirk, Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion **58**, 085005 (2016).
[27] H. Hu and J. Huang, Phys. Rev. **A92**, 062105 (2015).
[28] E. Raicher, S. Eliezer, and A. Zigler, arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.00476 (2016).

[29] A. Di Piazza (2016), arXiv:1608.08120.
[30] NIST, *Nist digital library of mathematical functions*, http://dlmf.nist.gov/ (2015).
[31] N. V. Elkina, A. M. Fedotov, C. Herzing, and H. Ruhl, Phys. Rev. E **89**, 053315 (2014).
[32] T. Heinzl and A. Ilderton, Opt. Commun. **282**, 1879 (2009).
[33] Note1, in this paper, a different convention for the Volkov ansatz $\exp(+ip \cdot x)$ is used.
[34] K. J. W. Müller-Kirsten, *Introduction to Quantum Mechanics* (World Scientific, 2006).
[35] C. M. Bender and S. A. Orszag, *Advanced Mathematical Methods for Scientists and Engineers* (Springer, 1978).
[36] H. Jeffreys, Proc. London Math. Soc. **s2-23(1)**, 428 (1925).
[37] A. Di Piazza, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 040402 (2014).
[38] A. Di Piazza, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 042118 (2015).
[39] C. Itzykson and J.-B. Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1980).
[40] C. Harvey, T. Heinzl, A. Ilderton, and M. Marklund, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 100402 (2012).
[41] J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1975).
[42] Note2, in the usual discussion of the validity of the plane wave model η is replaced with $\chi = \xi\eta$, but the reasoning is the same.
[43] V. B. Berestetskii, E. M. Lifshitz, and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Quantum Electrodynamics (second edition)* (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1982).
[44] D. Bauer, P. Mulser, and W. H. Steeb, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4622 (1995).
[45] A. E. Kaplan and A. L. Pokrovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 053601 (2005).
[46] A. Gonoskov, A. Bashinov, I. Gonoskov, C. Harvey, A. Ilderton, A. Kim, M. Marklund, G. Mourou, and A. Sergeev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 014801 (2014), URL `http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.014801`.